# 

1	SHOOK, HARDY & BACON LLP	GREENBERG TRAURIG
2	B. Trent Webb, Esq. (pro hac vice) Eric Buresh, Esq. (pro hac vice)	Mark G. Tratos, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 1086) Brandon Roos, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 7888) Leglia Godfaw, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 10220)
3	2555 Grand Boulevard Kansas City, Missouri 64108-2613	Leslie Godfrey, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 10229) 3773 Howard Hughes Parkway
4	Telephone: (816) 474-6550 Facsimile: (816) 421-5547	Suite 400 North Las Vegas, NV 89169
5	bwebb@shb.com eburesh@shb.com	Telephone: (702) 792-3773 Facsimile: (702) 792-9002
6	Robert H. Reckers, Esq. (pro hac vice)	tratosm@gtlaw.com roosb@gtlaw.com
7	600 Travis Street, Suite 1600	godfreyl@gtlaw.com
8	Houston, Texas 77002 Telephone: (713) 227-8008	
9	Facsimile: (731) 227-9508 rreckers@shb.com	Attorneys for Defendants RIMINI STREET, INC. and SETH RAVIN
10 11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		DIGEDICE COLUDE
20	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
21	ORACLE USA, INC., a Colorado corporation;	
22	ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware corporation; and ORACLE INTERNATIONAL	
23	CORPORATION, a California corporation,	Case No. 2:10-cv-0106-LRH-PAL
24	Plaintiffs,	DEFENDANTS' ADMINISTRATIVE
25	v.	MOTION TO PERMIT DEFENDANTS TO FILE UNDER SEAL CERTAIN
26	RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada corporation; SETH RAVIN, an individual,	EXHIBITS TO THE DECLARATION OF ROBERT H. RECKERS
27	Defendants.	
28	1	

### I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

Defendants Rimini Street, Inc., and Seth Ravin (collectively, "Defendants") respectfully request that the Court order the Clerk of the Court to file the following documents under seal:

- A document produced by Rimini in this litigation bearing Bates labels RSI01990917-918 (Exhibit A);
- 2. A document produced by Rimini in this litigation bearing Bates labels RS104807259-61 (**Exhibit B**);
- 3. A document produced by Rimini in this litigation bearing Bates label RSI06276320 (Exhibit C);
- 4. A copy of relevant excerpts from the deposition of Krista Williams, a Rimini witness produced in response to Oracle's deposition notice served on September 28, 2011, taken on October 5, 2011 (**Exhibit D**);
- 5. A copy of relevant excerpts from the deposition of J.R. Corpuz, a Rimini witness produced in response to Oracle's deposition notice served on February 8, 2011, taken on March 15, 2011 (**Exhibit H**); and
- 6. A copy of relevant excerpts from the deposition of Seth Ravin, a witness produced on July 10, 2010 in response to an Oracle deposition notice served in connection with the *Oracle Corp. et al v. SAP, AG* litigation (**Exhibit L**).

Placeholders for these documents were lodged with the Court on November 4, 2011. This request is made pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 5.2 and 26(c) and the Stipulated Protective Order entered by the Court on May 21, 2010 [Docket No. 55] ("Protective Order").

# II. <u>ARGUMENT</u>

Parties requesting to file documents under seal may overcome the presumption of public access by showing of good cause under Rule 26(c). "The law . . . gives district courts broad latitude to grant protective orders to prevent disclosure of materials for many types of information, including, but not limited to, trade secrets or other confidential research, development, or commercial

#### Case 2:10-cv-00106-LRH-VCF Document 166 Filed 11/04/11 Page 3 of 3

information. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(7)." Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd v. Gen. Motors Corp., 307 F.3d 1206, 1211 (9th Cir. 2002).

Good cause exists for filing the above listed documents under seal. They have been

Good cause exists for filing the above listed documents under seal. They have been designated as Confidential or Highly Confidential or they contain content that has been designated as Confidential or Highly Confidential under the terms of the Protective Order. By openly filing the remaining exhibits and documents that do not require confidentiality without seal, Defendants' request is narrowly tailored. Because the above listed documents contain information designated as either "Confidential" or "Highly Confidential—Attorney Eyes Only," good cause exists to permit a sealing order. See, e.g., Pacific Gas and Elec. Co. v. Lynch, 216 F. Supp. 2d 1016, 1027 (N.D. Cal. 2002).

## III. <u>CONCLUSION</u>

For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully requests that the Court find that good cause exists to file under seal Exhibits A, B, C, D, H, and L. A Proposed Order is submitted with this Motion.

DATED: November 4, 2011 SHOOK, HARDY & BACON

By: /s/Robert H. Reckers\_\_\_\_\_ Robert H. Reckers, Esq. Attorney for Defendants Rimini Street, Inc. and Seth Rayin